UNIVERSITY OF LONDON



POSTGRADUATE MEDICAL SCHOOL OF LONDON

Telegrams
POSGRADMED CHISK LONDON
Teleghone
SHEpherds Bush 1260 (4 lines)

DUCANE ROAD LONDON, W.12

Dept.of Bacteriology.

8th.April, 1952.

Ont lade the man of the east of the transfer son the Dean Cavalli, and the rate of the line is not the same of the

from the change thanks for your letter of 3/4/52 I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have sent to Lederberg. I hope you do nt mind my enswering you in this way just now but I am very busy. I much appreciate your suggestion of publishing your joint paper in the J.Gen.Microbiol. and I consider it an excellent idea to have our respective papers in the same number. I still have a certain amount of consolidation to do but this should not take more than 2-3 weeks when I can get down to it after the Oxford meeting next week. I have previously told you of my experiments on the relative efficiency of F+ X F+ and F+ X F- matings and you will see in my letter to Lederberg of another experiment arising out of these which, I think, eliminates the possibility of a union of two haploid sets of chromosomes, followed by crossing-over and meiosis. It will, of course, have to be repeated but I am reasonably confident of the results. I will send you copies of the relevant experimental protocols as soon as these have been photographed. If I confirm these results on the different distribution of marker patterns in relation to (58F+ X WF-), (WF+ X 58F-) and (58F+ X WF+)matings I shall, of course, abandon the term "gamete"but I am sticking to the gene donor and acceptor idea. My own views are (PTO

beginning to crystalise a bit. I think the best thing for me to do will be to send you a typescript of my forthcoming paper to the Soc. Gen. Microbiol. This will be only a skeleton, of course, but it will be a more precise formulation of my views at the moment than I may have given in my letters. You would find in it a firmer basis for commenting on my theory in your own paper and to this I am quite amenable. May I, too, discuss your view that F+ is transferred separately from those characters directly involved in "recombination" and determines the mating compatibility between the mutants, as well as accounting for the absence of mating between F- cells? I think I have your view correctly.

Thank you for your offer for further exchange of ideas and comments which I will certainly take advantage of. I am sorry about the dinner which certainly prejudiced a clear exchange of ideas but, perhaps, it was 'nt such a bad idea after all.'

With best wishes,

is given by $C_{i}^{*}(x,y)$. $C_{i}^{*}(x,y)$

Yours sincerely.

P.S. I learn from an American who has